



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,122	09/15/2003	Juha Sarmavuori	089229.00097	9082
32294	7590	02/05/2009	EXAMINER	
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP. 8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE 14TH FLOOR VIENNA, VA 22182-6212			MALEK, LEILA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		2611		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
02/05/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/662,122	Applicant(s) SARMAVUORI, JUHA
	Examiner LEILA MALEK	Art Unit 2611

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-36 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-23 and 25-36 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 April 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/06)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/22/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 11/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument: Applicant argues that, limitation "searching for a first error at a position bit K1", in view of the teachings in the specification, as described at least in paragraphs 0025 to 0033, is clearly definite.

Examiner's Response: Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner asserts that as explained in the last office action, from the language of the claim it is not clear whether the position of error K1 is known from the beginning of the searching process or a search has been performed to find the position of error bit K1. If the first interpretation of Examiner from the claim is correct then the claim is inconsistent with Applicant's invention. Examiner states that the claims and statement of invention are generally taken as they read and limitations appearing in the specification but not clearly recited in

the claim should not be read into the claim. Therefore, the language of claims should be modified to reflect Applicant's invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent¹ and recent Federal Circuit decisions² indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to another statutory category (such as a particular apparatus), or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. While the instant claim(s) recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, the claim(s) neither transform underlying subject matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. For example in claim 1, the steps of searching a first error, counting a number of bit errors, and detecting octet slip by analyzing the error bits can be performed by mental steps (which is not statutory subject matter) (see Fig. 2) and Applicant does not provide any evidence in the body of the claim that the method steps have been positively tied to an apparatus.

¹ *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

² *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As to claim 1, lines 4-5, from the language of the claim it is not clear whether the position of error K1 is known from the beginning of the searching process or a search has been performed to find the position of error bit K1. If the first interpretation of Examiner from the claim is correct then the claim is inconsistent with Applicant's invention.

5. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As to claim 1, line 1, limitation "detecting an assumed octet slip" is vague and indefinite, because it is not clear how the Applicant makes the assumption that the octet slip (error) exists. The signaling block might be an error free block (as shown in Fig. 2B, blocks 20-22), therefore the above assumption may not be a valid assumption.

6. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As to claim 12, lines 6-7, from the language of the claim it is not clear whether the position of error K1 is known from the beginning of the searching process or a search has been performed to find the position of error bit K1. If

the first interpretation of Examiner from the claim is correct then the claim is inconsistent with Applicant's invention.

7. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As to claim 12, line 1, limitation "detecting an assumed octet slip" is vague and indefinite, because it is not clear how the Applicant makes the assumption that the octet slip (error) exists. The signaling block might be an error free block (as shown in Fig. 2B, blocks 20-22), therefore the above assumption may not be a valid assumption.

8. Claims 23 and 25-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As to claim 23, lines 8-9, from the language of the claim it is not clear whether the position of error K1 is known from the beginning of the searching process or a search has been performed to find the position of error bit K1. If the first interpretation of Examiner from the claim is correct then the claim is inconsistent with Applicant's invention.

9. Claims 23 and 25-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. As to claim 23, line 1, limitation "detecting an assumed octet slip" is vague and indefinite, because it is not clear how the Applicant makes the assumption that the octet slip (error) exists. The signaling block might be an

Art Unit: 2611

error free block (as shown in Fig. 2B, blocks 20-22), therefore the above assumption may not be a valid assumption.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (US 5,050,171).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LEILA MALEK whose telephone number is (571)272-8731. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leila Malek

Examiner
Art Unit 2611

/L. M./
/Leila Malek/
Examiner, Art Unit 2611

/Mohammad H Ghayour/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2611